The Deferred Gratification Pattern: A Preliminary Study
Author(s): Louis Schneider and Sverre Lysgaard
Source: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Apr., 1953), pp. 142-149
Published by: American Sociological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2087723
Accessed: 10-01-2016 16:41 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sage Publications, Inc. and American Sociological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Sociological Review*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

THE DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERN: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

LOUIS SCHNEIDER AND SVERRE LYSGAARD

Purdue University

SCATTERED pieces of sociological research have highlighted what we shall call "the deferred gratification pattern." The present paper is not primarily directed toward documentation of these bits of research, but it will gather together significant points from a number of them and will present some of the results of a preliminary empirical study designed to carry forward an exploration of the deferred gratification pattern.

Deferred gratification evidently refers to postponement of gratifications or satisfactions. Thus, in the job area, as Hollingshead shows, the lower-class boy, eager to pay his own way and escape family domination, seeks a full-time job at a very early age and accordingly leaves school.[1] The freedom he thus obtains happens to be illusory and he finds himself caught in a round of jobs with low pay and little promise. Deferment of the gratification of being employed and independent, through the process of obtaining a more elaborate education before one seeks a job, is eventually rewarded. But it is not necessarily implied that deferment of gratification is always worthwhile, and this is in any case largely beyond our present concern. The deferment of gratification occurs in many other areas. It may be contended that it does indeed fall into a *pattern,* characteristic of the so-called "middle class," members of which tend to delay achievement of economic independence through a relatively elaborate process of education, tend to defer sexual gratification through intercourse, show a relatively marked tendency to save money, and the like. For purposes of this preliminary specification, two further points must be noted. The deferred gratification pattern appears to be closely associated with "impulse renunciation."[2] Thus, some of the pertinent current literature emphasizes, by way of example, middle-class renunciation of impulses toward violence. The concepts of deferment and renunciation tend, however, to overlap. One may renounce only temporarily, and the question as to whether we are dealing with renunciation or with deferment becomes verbal. A more important point is the *normative* character of the deferred gratification pattern. Middle class persons feel that they *should* save, postpone, and renounce a variety of gratifications. There are very probably also normative elements in the "lower class" pattern of non-deferment. Thus, Whyte notes that one of the important divergences between the social mobility pattern and the corner-boy activity pattern in Cornerville appears in matters involving expenditure of money. The college boys save money for educational purposes or to launch business or professional careers. But the corner boys must share their money with others and avoid middle class thrift. Should a corner boy have money and his friend not have it, he is expected to spend for both. The corner boy may be thrifty, but, if so, he cannot hope to hold a high position in the corner gang.[3]

Through the work of Kinsey and his associates much clarification has been given to the deferred gratification pattern as it manifests itself in the sexual sphere. Ginzberg notes that "the poor" discount the future more heavily than "the better situated classes," and thereby, in our terms, as far as sexual intercourse is concerned, they do not defer gratification, i.e., relatively to "higher" classes.[4] Kinsey and his co-workers

[1] A. B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth,* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949, Ch. 14.

[2] This notion, or close approximations thereto, has also cropped up frequently in recent sociological literature. See, e.g., A. Davis and R. J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing," in *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 11 (December, 1946), pp. 698–710.

[3] W. F. Whyte, *Street Corner Society,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943, p. 106.

[4] E. Ginzberg, "Sex and Class Behavior," in D. P. Geddes and E. Curie (Editors), *About the Kinsey Report,* New York: The New American Library, 1948, p. 134.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

supply pertinent evidence.[5] Relatively, "lower" class persons indulge considerably in pre-marital intercourse; "upper" class persons show relative deferment of gratification in this sector of behavior. One illustrative comment may be remarked. This is to the effect that in two or three lower level communities it was not possible to discover a single male who had not had sexual relations with girls by the time he had reached the age of sixteen or seventeen. The rare boy who had not had such relations by that age was either physically handicapped, mentally defective, homosexual, or "earmarked for moving out of his community and going to college."[6]

Work designed to describe the pattern of deferred gratification in something like its entirety is especially marked in some of the research on Negro classes. Drake and Cayton, in probing upper-class definitions of lower class life, emphasize the definition of a pattern of that life. They summarize some of the testimony of upper class interviewees, indicating that a few of those interviewed defined the lower class solely in terms of economic criteria, high income meaning high status, and low income low status; but that a larger number thought of a pattern, a constellation of traits, when they sought a definition of the lower class. The trait that most consistently emerged as clue to lower class status was "rowdy or indecorous behavior in public." Lower class people do not restrain their emotions and are ignorant of "how to act," of correct dress, of wise expenditure of money.[7] One gathers from the context that Drake and Cayton would largely accept the descriptive, if not the evaluative, aspects of this upper class view of the lower class pattern of life. The relevance of the description to the deferred gratification pattern is unmistakable. An earlier study by Davis and Dollard,[8] likewise of classes within a Negro community, is also highly pertinent and constituted perhaps the most immediate inspiration to the undertaking of the research reported in this paper. The present writers proceeded on the assumption that the Davis-Dollard study might be illuminating for (at least American) class structure in general, despite its formal concern with classes in the Negro community alone. The study indicated that "impulse-following" (with minimal deferment or renunciation of "impulses" or gratifications) was characteristic of lower class Negroes and "impulse-renunciation" (or deferment of impulse-gratification) characteristic of middle class Negroes in "Old City" in the South. The study is more insightful than rigorous, and there are undoubtedly difficulties with its categorizations of class itself. Nevertheless, we may construct from it a useful listing under the general caption of the class patterning of deferred gratification. This listing served as a starting-point in our own research. The lower-class-characteristic "impulse-following" (absence of deferred gratification pattern) involves: relative readiness to engage in physical violence, free sexual expression (as through intercourse), minimum pursuit of education, low aspiration level, failure of parents to identify the class of their children's playmates, free spending, little emphasis on being "well-mannered and obedient," and short-time dependence on parents. On the other hand, the middle-class-characteristic "impulse-renunciation" (presence of deferred gratification pattern) involves the reverse of these traits: relative reluctance to engage in physical violence, and the like.

Admittedly, this is a rough listing and leaves us still far from a thoroughly comprehensive specification of the deferred gratification pattern. Some of the items may appear equivocal. For example, identification of class of playmates by parents perhaps does not carry on the face of it the reason

[5] Cf. the data of A. C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy and C. E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male,* Philadelphia and London: W. B. Saunders Co., 1948, Ch. 10.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 381. The words quoted point to what may become one of the most significant foci of study of the deferred gratification pattern—the extent to which there is early adoption by those who become upward-mobile of the class patterns of the "higher" classes, a problem given some emphasis in the work of the Warner school.

[7] St. Clair Drake and H. R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis,* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945, pp. 562–3. See also, *ibid.,* pp. 559–562. Pertinent statements or incidental comments bearing directly or indirectly upon the deferred gratification pattern or its absence, will be found, *ibid.* pp. 523, 586, 590, 592, 608, 661–2, 690, 692, 705, 714.

[8] A. Davis and J. Dollard, *Children of Bondage,* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

for its inclusion. But it is conceived that such identification implies a concern for the maintenance of certain standards and a fear lest they be jeopardized by the contamination of "unfortunate" associations. Some items mentioned by Davis and Dollard are omitted from the list. Thus, reference is made to the "reliable middle class conscience" by contrast with the "less reliable" lower class conscience.[9] This is at a somewhat different level of abstraction from the other traits and activities noted and not so easy to handle in the type of research to be reported, and it has therefore been omitted. Finally, following Davis and Dollard, the listing tends to focus on children, but the implications plainly extend beyond them alone.

Although nothing like exhaustive documentation of the consideration of the deferred gratification pattern by sociologists has been attempted, and although we have not sought to offer anything like a finished specification of the pattern itself, the above is perhaps sufficient to suggest that the pattern deserves systematic investigation and that it is time to co-ordinate the bits of research endeavor that have been directed toward its study. The following preliminary and partially reported research is designed to do no more than make an appropriate step forward.

THE RESEARCH

The data utilized for the present research are based on a representative sample of 2500 high school students. This is drawn from a larger nation-wide sample of some 15,000 high school students.[10] Although the sample, as stated, is "representative," it is not representative of all the nation's *teenagers,* only of the high school population. In an investigation dealing with differential responses among *social classes,* it is, of course, of particular importance that our sample is more homogeneously middle class than the total population of high school age. The homogeneity of the sample produces an underestimate of the class differentials in the population at large. The sample does not extend adequately into the lower rungs of the stratification ladder. This probable under-representation of the lower class should serve to increase confidence in the trends actually observed.

Subjects were asked to check one of twelve occupational classes, designating the one most similar to the occupation of their fathers. These twelve occupational classifications were grouped into four occupational classes according to degree of supervisory power over "lower" occupations and independence of supervisory control from "higher" occupations. The four occupational classes follow: *Class 1. Independent Occupations* (including executives, directors, owners of business or farm, doctors, lawyers, bankers, ministers, professors, consulting engineers); *Class 2. Dependent Occupations Involving Skill and Supervision or Manipulation of Others* (including supervisors, foremen, technical engineers in industrial employment, sales workers, agents, clerks or secretaries in small businesses, teachers, nurses, preachers, reporters, public officials, entertainers); *Class 3. Dependent Occupations Involving Skill but Little Supervision or Manipulation of Others* (including skilled and semi-skilled workers and workers in industrial employment); *Class 4. Dependent Occupations Involving Little Skill and Little Supervision or Manipulation of Others* (including assembly line workers, laborers, janitors, farm workers, road workers, miners, drivers).

These occupational classes are admittedly not internally homogeneous in respect to such class criteria as "income," "prestige" or "social equality." It was intended that the classification be independent of such criteria, which at their face value might be contingent upon a certain way of life. The variable, the deferred gratification pattern (DGP), which is to be related to class affiliation is itself at least an important *element* of a "way of life," and we wished to avoid as far as possible the danger of

[9] *Ibid.,* pp. 119 and 133.

[10] The data were obtained through the Purdue Opinion Panel, Poll Number 32, administered by the Division of Educational Reference at Purdue University, Indiana. The Purdue nation-wide sample of 15,000 is fairly representative of the total high school population in the country in such factors as sex, rural-urban residence, religion, political affiliation, level of education of mothers, and house and home characteristics. The smaller sample of 2500 which we utilize has been *stratified* according to geographical region and grade in school, but strictly *randomized* from the total return of 15,000 with respect to the other characteristics listed above.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

obtaining an association between "class" and "response" that might turn out to be in considerable part tautological.[11]

The writers have emphasized that the occupational "classes" are not "social classes" in the sense of comprising people with clearly "common" interests, or with "class consciousness." In order to get a more "subjective" classification of our subjects we also asked them to choose one of four class designations as the one most fitting for themselves and their families: the "upper class," the "middle class," the "working class," and the "lower class."[12]

TABLE 1. CLASS SELF-IDENTIFICATION OF FOUR OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES*

Occupational Classes	Self-Identification "Middle"	"Working"	Total
1. Independent	80	20	100
2. Dependent, manipulative	75	25	100
3. Dependent, skilled	63	37	100
4. Dependent, unskilled	50	50	100

* Figures in percentages. Differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level.

It proved feasible, however, to use only "middle" and "working" class self-identifications, assimilating the very few other responses to these.

[11] This points to a danger that, in general, constantly besets current class research. For example, Hollingshead's proposition that there is a functional relation between the class position of the family of an adolescent and his "social behavior" in his community (*Elmtown's Youth,* p. 441) would be more impressive if the rating procedure Hollingshead originally relies upon did not allow for the possibility that the adolescent's social behavior itself enters as an element into the determination of the class position of his family.

[12] The procedure is borrowed from Richard Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949, Ch. VI. The middle class bias of our sample is indicated by the high frequency of "middle class" self-identification (about two-thirds of the subjects so identifying themselves), compared to Centers' figure for his national, male, white sample (less than one-half of the subjects identifying themselves as "middle class"). The relationship between the two classifications may be of some interest and is shown. (Since very few of our subjects marked "lower class" and "upper class" as their choice, the few "lower class" responses have been added to the "working class" category, and the "upper class" responses to the "middle class" category.)

The poll included twenty-eight DGP-related questions. It is impossible to present all of the results here or to give them full statistical exploration. We can only affirm that our results generally give good support to the hypothesis that a class-related DGP pattern exists, *especially when the self-identification index of class is used.* Beyond this mere affirmation, we can present some *selected* results that are of considerable interest. Fairly typical results emerge if we follow the listing of patterns described by Davis and Dollard, and the discussion following is confined to these.

Physical Violence. The poll results show that the students who identify themselves with the "working class" report in a slightly higher proportion than those who identify themselves with the "middle class" that they have had one or more fights recently (differences significant at the 5 per cent level), that they have seen adult fights recently (differences not significant at the 5 per cent level), and that they prefer to "settle matters right away" rather than "let their temper quiet down" first (differences significant at the 1 per cent level). Slight differences are also found among the occupational classes in respect to the same questions, the lower occupational classes giving the above responses more frequently than the higher ones. The magnitude of the differences is in no case impressive, however, and we consider that these results give only slight support to the Davis-Dollard observations, as far as the occupational differentiations go.

Free Sexuality. The polling technique is not the best one for studying the sexual behavior of high school children. The poll questions had to be formulated rather vaguely because of prevalent attitudes regarding sexual matters in our high schools, and they failed to yield any clues to class differences in sexual behavior. The writers believe this failure to be accidental; it is certainly not definitive.

Marked Pursuit of Education. Data relating to education are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

The limitations of the data of Tables 2 and 3 are evident and need no special comment. The results are nevertheless in conformity with the DGP hypothesis, although

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

TABLE 2. PLANS AFTER GRADUATION FROM HIGH SCHOOL OF STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

Class Index	Plans: To go to college or take special training other than college	Plans: To go to work, enlist in military service, or "other plans"	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	56	44	100
"Working"	42	58	100
Occupational Class			
1	62	38	100
2	61	39	100
3	48	52	100
4	32	68	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows that differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level for both class indices.

obviously they do not give conclusive proof of it.[13]

High Aspiration Level. Students were asked on a list of twelve occupations (ranging from high to low in terms of income and prestige) to check those which they considered "not good enough" for their own life work. The higher the number thus checked the higher the occupational aspirations of the students. Table 4 summarizes relevant data.

Identification of Class of Playmates by Parents. On the item, "My parents have definite ideas about what my friends should be like," there are small differences (not significant at the 5 per cent level) among the classes, the parents in the higher classes being reported to be more concerned about friends of children. The students themselves, however, seem to differ in respect to concern with the family backgrounds of their friends. Thus, 66 per cent of those

[13] In the original, more complete study, the data were analyzed for partial association, i.e., the association between class of self-identification and response, within each of the occupational classes, and the association between occupational class and response, within each of the classes of self-identification. This analysis showed that when the variation of occupational class is accounted for there is still a significant association between class of self-identification and response. Thus, we may say that "economic opportunity," as far as that may be reflected by occupational class, is not solely responsible for the differences among the classes.

TABLE 3. EXPECTATION OF GRADUATION FROM HIGH SCHOOL AMONG STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

Class Index	Expectations of Graduation: Definitely expect to graduate	Expectations of Graduation: Do not expect to graduate or will only "probably" graduate	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	80	20	100
"Working"	70	30	100
Occupational Class			
1	82	18	100
2	82	18	100
3	76	24	100
4	68	32	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows that differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level for both class indices.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

TABLE 4. OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS BY SOCIAL CLASSES*

Class Index	Median number of occupations checked as "Not Good Enough"
Self-Identification	
"Middle"	5.4
"Working"	4.8
Occupational Class	
1	5.4
2	5.3
3	5.2
4	4.9

* The difference between the medians is significant at the 1 per cent level in the case of the classes of self-identification. The median for the lowest occupational class is smaller than any of the medians of the other classes by a statistically significant amount. The differences of the medians for the upper occupational classes are not statistically significant.

who identify themselves with the "middle" class and 56 per cent of those who identify themselves with the "working" class (differences significant at the 1 per cent level) say that they "enjoy being together with friends who come from families at least as nice and successful as my own, rather than being together with just anybody."[14]

[14] On this same item, there is an opposite, although not statistically significant, tendency among the occupational groups.

TABLE 5. SPENDING PREFERENCES AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

	Responses to the question "If you won a big prize, say two thousand dollars, what would you do?"		
Class Index	Spend most of it right away	Save most of it	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	27	73	100
"Working"	32	68	100
Occupational Class			
1	23	77	100
2	28	72	100
3	31	69	100
4	34	66	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level for both class indices.

Free Spending. Relevant data are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 6. SPENDING HABITS AMONG PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

	Responses to statement, "In my family we always seem to be broke just before payday, no matter how much money is coming in."		
Class Index	Agree	Disagree	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	28	72	100
"Working"	43	57	100
Occupational Class			
1	16	84	100
2	32	68	100
3	39	61	100
4	45	55	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level for both class indices.

Being Well-Mannered and Obedient. This trait, or complex of traits, was examined only in the specific matter of table manners. Table 7 shows the pertinent data for the classes of self-identification but omits the data for occupational classes, for which there was no clear trend.

Prolonged Dependence on Parents. This was examined through the single indicator

TABLE 7. CONCERN FOR TABLE MANNERS AMONG PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

	Responses to question, "How would your parents feel if you rested your elbows on the table while eating and talked with your mouth full?"		
Class Index	They would object	They would object a little or wouldn't mind	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	74	26	100
"Working"	67	33	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of savings for children, and our results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8. SAVINGS FOR CHILDREN AMONG PARENTS OF STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES*

	Students think that parents have saved money to give them a start in life.		
Class Index	Yes	No	Total
Self-Identification			
"Middle"	82	18	100
"Working"	70	30	100
Occupational Class			
1	86	14	100
2	81	19	100
3	75	25	100
4	71	29	100

* Figures in percentages. The chi square test shows differences are significant beyond the 1 per cent level for both class indices.

There is little point in elaborating the many qualifications on the significance in relation to the DGP of the above data. The professional sociologist can supply some of these for himself, but it appears obvious that the DGP is worthy of systematic research.

DISCUSSION

It is appropriate to add a few suggestions and questions relating to the theoretical significance of the pattern.

(1) The pattern may turn out to have major significance for the "problem of order." Are there certain "advantages," certain socio-psychological "gains," that the so-called lower class has? It seems worthwhile to investigate the view that the lower class does have such advantages and reaps the "pleasures" of following impulse and not "deferring." Discounting the future, taking the cash and letting the credit go, disavowing major and worrisome self-disciplines, lower class persons may conceivably have a certain contentment that keeps them attached to an existing social order even when, from the point of view of other classes, they "live like animals."[15]

(2) The pattern carries implications regarding middle class sensitivity to failure to realize rewards if the pattern is carried out uselessly. Fromm has contended, in other terminology, that disappointment and bitterness over the very slight results achieved from adherence to the DGP among lower middle class persons in Germany after World War I were of considerable force in helping Nazism to power. "If the savings of many years, for which one had sacrificed so many little pleasures, could be lost through no fault of one's own, what was the point in saving anyway?"[16] Here again we have relevance to the problem of order. It is an old and familiar contention that jobless intellectuals are a threat to any existing social system. In more general terms, to what extent does the failure of the DGP to "pay off" mean a revolutionary reaction, or perhaps merely a private neurotic reaction? And to what extent does the pattern have functional autonomy, so that while it may have had some initial partial motivation, at any rate, in considerations of expediency alone, it cannot be sloughed off and another way of life adopted at will even when it might be convenient to be able to do the latter?

(3) In view of recent interest in class mobility, it may be suggested that one fruitful line of inquiry relates to the reaction of lower class individuals toward the incipient manifestation of tendencies toward the DGP on the part of others who are lower class. Would it be possible to develop a typology on pertinent lines? We may speculate that the following types of reactions would appear: (a) A reaction of lack of comprehension, conceivably rooting at times in lack of sympathy. "What's the point of this sort of behavior?" One goes out at fourteen or thereabouts to make a living, and no fuss about it. Anything else is not understandable. This sort of reaction may well require a rather firmly stabilized lower class tradition, not susceptible to the blandishments held out, for example, by higher education. (b) A "humble" reaction. "This education business (for example) isn't for the likes of me." Here we might well anticipate anger at others from the same class because of their "pretensions." (c) A derisive reaction,

[15] Perhaps the most fertile suggestions on this point have come from John Dollard, in his *Caste and Class in a Southern Town,* New York: Harper and Bros., 1949, esp. Ch. XVII.

[16] Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom,* New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941, p. 214.

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

on the line, "You're a sissy to study, to save, to defer."

The above can only claim to be suggestions. They are deliberately neither systematic nor comprehensive. But they point to issues which are bound to come to the fore if sociologists address themselves to serious study of the DGP.

INSTABILITIES IN STATUS: THE PROBLEM OF HIERARCHY IN THE COMMUNITY STUDY OF STATUS ARRANGEMENTS *

GREGORY P. STONE and WILLIAM H. FORM
Michigan State College

DURING the last decade, many objections have been raised against existing conceptions of social stratification.[1] While it is certainly to the credit of the Warner group that it has elicited such carefully considered and often trenchant discussions of social stratification, it is scarcely to the credit of the critics that so little research has been based upon their many well-taken criticisms. In their eagerness to disclose shortcomings in every phase of inquiry—methodological, conceptual, statistical, and ideological—the critics, with few exceptions, have only hinted at guide lines for future research.[2]

Beneath the controversy probably lie certain "cultish" or "professional-ideological" commitments which, in their lack of appropriateness to the argument, further obfuscate our view of the nature of social stratification. It is not the purpose of this paper to scrutinize such commitments, but we would like to join our complaint with that of David Riesman, who has commented that "all the arguments which go on so tiresomely . . . between Warner and the Marxists seem . . . an argument as to which status system runs the country, when, in fact, neither does."[3] Specifically, this paper questions: (1) the adequacy of conceiving status *groups* as comprising the basic units of the social order; (2) the fruitfulness of conceiving status groupings as hierarchically arranged in the structural analysis of status stratification; and (3) the appropriateness of a hierarchical conception of *status arrangement*[4] for facilitating the study of social process.

This is not to say that the long and, at times, heated discussion has gone for naught, because it has served to isolate the principal areas of methodological confusion confronting sociological investigation into problems of social stratification. These have been summarized and commented upon elsewhere,[5] but three of them need to be spelled

* This study is part of a larger research project sponsored by the Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station. The authors are indebted to Joel Smith for a critical reading of the manuscript.

[1] The critical analyses in this period of stratification theory and research were undoubtedly initiated by C. Wright Mills' appraisal of W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942) in *American Sociological Review,* VII (April, 1942), pp. 263–271.

[2] Numbered among the exceptions would be Paul K. Hatt and Milton M. Gordon. See Paul K. Hatt, "Social Stratification in the Mass Society," *American Sociological Review,* XV (April, 1950), pp. 216–222; and Milton M. Gordon, "A System of Social Class Analysis," *The Drew University Bulletin,* XXXIX (August, 1951), pp. 3–19. The citation of these references does not imply that either contribution is accepted here without qualification. Specifically, the application of Hatt's paradigm for the study of the mass society—presumably based upon Weber's distinctions among the social, economic, and political orders of stratification—may be shown to violate the logic of Weber's analysis. As far as Gordon's excellent contribution is concerned, the unqualified view of social stratification as hierarchical in nature is a view to which this article takes exception.

[3] David Riesman, "Some Observations Concerning Marginality," *Phylon,* XII (Second Quarter, 1951), p. 117.

[4] The answer to this question is anticipated in the choice of terms. The term "arrangement" has been selected primarily because such alternatives as "system" or "structure" imply closure (although on different levels of analysis).

[5] Paul K. Hatt, *op. cit., passim;* and Milton M. Gordon, *op. cit., passim.* See also Llewellyn Gross, "The Use of Class Concepts in Sociological Research," *American Journal of Sociology,* LIV (March, 1949); and, for a more empirical critique,

This content downloaded from 130.237.29.138 on Sun, 10 Jan 2016 16:41:40 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions